

United States Patent and Trademark Office

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450 www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.	
10/662,016	09/11/2003	Michael D. Murphy	TRMB699.CON	8585	
7	590 01/26/2005		EXAM	INER	-
WAGNER, MURABITO & HAO LLP			POPE, DARYL C		
Third Floor			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER	-
Two North Market Street			ARTONIT	TATER NOMBER	_
San Jose, CA 95113			2632		

DATE MAILED: 01/26/2005

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

			1 /1
	Application No.	Applicant(s)	
	10/662,016	MURPHY, MICHAEL D.	
Office Action Summary	Examiner	Art Unit	
	DARYL C POPE	2632	_
The MAILING DATE of this communica Period for Reply	tion appears on the cover sheet w	ith the correspondence address -	•
A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICA - Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 3 after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communic - If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) da - If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statute - Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, Any reply received by the Office later than three months after earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).	ATION. 7 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a cation. ays, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirry period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MOI by statute, cause the application to become A	reply be timely filed ty (30) days will be considered timely. NTHS from the mailing date of this communica BANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133).	ition.
Status			
1) Responsive to communication(s) filed of	on		
2a) This action is FINAL . 2b)			
3) Since this application is in condition for closed in accordance with the practice	·	· ·	is
Disposition of Claims			
4)⊠ Claim(s) <u>1-32</u> is/are pending in the app 4a) Of the above claim(s) is/are v 5)□ Claim(s) is/are allowed.			
6)⊠ Claim(s) <u>1-32</u> is/are rejected.			
7) Claim(s) is/are objected to.		·	
8) Claim(s) are subject to restriction	n and/or election requirement.	•	
Application Papers			
9) The specification is objected to by the E	xaminer.		
10) The drawing(s) filed on is/are: a)	☐ accepted or b)☐ objected to	by the Examiner.	
Applicant may not request that any objection	n to the drawing(s) be held in abeyar	nce. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).	
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the			
11)☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by	the Examiner. Note the attached	d Office Action or form PTO-152.	
Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119			
12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of: 1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority doc		3 119(a)-(d) or (f).	
2. Certified copies of the priority doc	cuments have been received in A	pplication No	
3. Copies of the certified copies of the	he priority documents have been	received in this National Stage	
application from the International	, , , , , , , , , , , , , , , , , , , ,		
* See the attached detailed Office action fo	or a list of the certified copies not	received.	
Attachment(s)			
Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)	4) \prod Interview S	Summary (PTO-413)	
$\mathbb{P}(\mathbb{P})$ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-	948) Paper No(s	s)/Mail Date	
 B) Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO Paper No(s)/Mail Date 	6) Other:	nformal Patent Application (PTO-152) 	

Application/Control Number: 10/662,016 Page 2

Art Unit: 2632

DETAILED ACTION

Double Patenting

1. The nonstatutory double patenting rejection is based on a judicially created doctrine grounded in public policy (a policy reflected in the statute) so as to prevent the unjustified or improper timewise extension of the "right to exclude" granted by a patent and to prevent possible harassment by multiple assignees. See *In re Goodman*, 11 F.3d 1046, 29 USPQ2d 2010 (Fed. Cir. 1993); *In re Longi*, 759 F.2d 887, 225 USPQ 645 (Fed. Cir. 1985); *In re Van Ornum*, 686 F.2d 937, 214 USPQ 761 (CCPA 1982); *In re Vogel*, 422 F.2d 438, 164 USPQ 619 (CCPA 1970);and, *In re Thorington*, 418 F.2d 528, 163 USPQ 644 (CCPA 1969).

A timely filed terminal disclaimer in compliance with 37 CFR 1.321(c) may be used to overcome an actual or provisional rejection based on a nonstatutory double patenting ground provided the conflicting application or patent is shown to be commonly owned with this application. See 37 CFR 1.130(b).

Effective January 1, 1994, a registered attorney or agent of record may sign a terminal disclaimer. A terminal disclaimer signed by the assignee must fully comply with 37 CFR 3.73(b).

- 2. Claims 1-32 are rejected under the judicially created doctrine of obviousness-type double patenting as being unpatentable over claims 1-32, respectively, of U.S. Patent No. 6,717,509('509). Although the conflicting claims are not identical, they are not patentably distinct from each other because of the following:
- -- Claims 1,3,12,14,20,22,24, and 26 recite substantially the same subject matter as that of claims 1,3,12,14,20,22,24, and 26, respectively, of '509, except for:
 - 1) receiving the first message from a remote message transmission device;
 - 2) receiving the message from the device utilizing a computer; and
 - 3) transmitting the second message back to the message transmission device utilizing a computer.

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to transmit and receive messages from a device utilizing a

Art Unit: 2632

computer since use of electronic messaging systems utilizing computers are well known, and therefore would have allowed greater flexibility, and saved time and resources for communicating messages within a system. Furthermore, utilization of a remote message transmission device would have allowed the system to be implemented in virtually any place as desired, thereby allowing expansion and greater use of the system.

- -- Claim 7 recites substantially the same subject matter as that of claim 7 in the '509 patent, except for:
 - 1) opening of the gate is included as opposed to a task to be performed.

It would have been obvious that the system of present invention would have been operable to perform one of many tasks including opening of a gate, and therefore, one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the advantage would have recognized the advantage of implementing opening of a gate, or any other task to be performed that would have been allowed by the system.

-- Claims 2,4-6,8-11,13,15-19,21,23,25, and 27-32 recite substantially the same subject matter as that recited in claims 2,4-6,8-11,13,15-19,21,23,25, and 27-32 of the '509 patent.

Conclusion

3. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to DARYL C POPE whose telephone number is (571) 272-2959. The examiner can normally be reached on M-TH 8:00-6:30.

Application/Control Number: 10/662,016

Art Unit: 2632

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, DANIEL WU can be reached on (571) 272-2964. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 703-872-9306.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see http://pair-direct.uspto.gov. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

Daryl C. Pope

Jan. 20, 2005

DARYL C POPE

Page 4

Rrimary Examiner
Art Unit 2632